

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make
orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

CONTENTS:

Signs of the Times:

	PAGE
A Lenten Pastoral by a Layman	607
The Master of Balliol on the Two Moralities ..	609
English Paganism and its Remedy	611
The Need for Re-Establishment	614
The Harborne Rite and its Critics	617
Mahatma Gandhi	619
Gamaliel Milner, M.A.	
The Ministry of Truth	624
Chancellor H. G. Mulliner, M.A.	
John Martin Creed	631
Obituary—Fergus Henry Wood, James Arthur Davies, James Robert Charles Webb.	

Book Reviews:

Dr. Temple's Readings in St. John's Gospel ..	636
A Poet looks at the History of the Church ..	639
A Convincing Christian Anthropology	640
Jottings of an Early Reformer	642
The Sphere of the Church as a Social Worker	643
The Seer of Patmos	644
Diagnoses and Remedies	645

Correspondence:

Dr. Coulton and Papal Totalitarianism; A Fixed
Easter and Calendar Reform; The Bankruptcy of
Pacifism; Traditional Christianity and a World
Religion; Marvels: Miraculous or Non-Miraculous?



OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1s. net

Annual Subscription, 10/6

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.



BOOKS FOR THE SERVICES

A Message from the First Lord of the Admiralty

YOU can help by buying a few books to post direct to your own friends in the Services or by sending a parcel of your own books to

THE SERVICE LIBRARIES AND BOOKS FUND, FINSBURY BARRACKS, LONDON, E.C.1

WE will gladly collect parcels of books from our customers in our normal delivery area. May we suggest to *Modern Churchman* subscribers that when paying their subscriptions they should add a small sum (say sixpence) to be used for buying books for the services.

"Any scheme which is likely to increase the supply of good literature to men and women of the Services commands my support. It is of great importance that those on active service should not feel isolated by their duty from the cultural life of civilised society which they are working to preserve."

WINSTON S.

CHURCHILL

B. H. BLACKWELL OXFORD

RIPON HALL, OXFORD.

Founder : Bishop BOYD CARPENTER, D.D., D.C.L., K.C.V.O.

Warden : The Right Rev. Bishop STRONG, G.B.E., D.D., Hon. D.Mus.

Principal : Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

Vice-Principal : Rev. L. B. CROSS, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College.

Chaplain : Rev. A. W. ADAMS, M.A.

Resident Tutor : Rev. W. RICHARDSON, M.A., Queen's College.

Lecturer : Rev. JOHN TODD, M.A., Hertford College.

RIPON HALL is a Graduate Theological College established to provide a training on modern lines for those seeking Holy Orders in any diocese of the Anglican Communion.

Ripon Hall is licensed for residence by the University of Oxford. This privilege permits its members, possessed of senior status, to pursue their theological studies in the University and to qualify for the Diploma and Degrees in Theology.

Full particulars of Courses, Fees, Exhibitions, etc., can be had on application to the Principal, Ripon Hall, Boars Hill, Oxford.

Laymen who desire a broad-minded, sympathetic, and well-educated Clergy can materially assist this end by contributing to the Exhibition Fund of Ripon Hall, and to its endowment.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 12.

MARCH, 1940.

VOL. XXIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

A LENTEN PASTORAL BY A LAYMAN.

Lord Halifax's address to the University of Oxford in the Sheldonian Theatre on February 27 will not quickly be forgotten by those who heard it. Lord Halifax spoke, not only as Foreign Secretary and Chancellor of the University, but also as a great English Churchman. It was not a dual, but a tri-partite, personality which liberated its soul and inspired its hearers on that memorable occasion. The speech was not only political and educational but also deeply religious. It was a Lenten Pastoral delivered by a layman. Lord Halifax dealt with Pacifism, that attractive, deceptive, and possibly most detrimental of modern heresies because it comes to us in the guise of an angel of light.

'I know that it is said by men of high principle that force in itself, if not an evil thing, has a value only negative. I think this is an exaggeration. Most true it is that force cannot of itself exorcize the evil spirits that enter and deprave the hearts of men. But when these evil spirits invoke force for the prosecution of their purpose, and the struggle is thus joined in the physical arena, it is only by force on the battleground thus chosen that the evil can be resisted. Nor can I doubt that, if under what I must hold to be a one-sided and mistaken interpretation of our Lord's teaching we refrain on principle from replying in kind to the use of force, we may be surrendering to extinction the most sacred causes for which we stand to posterity as guardians and trustees. Thus force, by resisting the destructive power of evil and guarding the field in which good can work, can render positive service which can be given in no other way. As I see this problem, which is to-day so tragically forced upon our thought, it is the spiritual motive,

alike in national as in individual action, on which judgment has to be passed. Always it is the spirit behind the application of force which makes or mars its value. And we may assuredly hope that the same spirit which gives the physical and moral courage to defend the menaced values of life to-day will avail us when we come through the valley of dark decision to the work of reconstruction.'

At this time when there is a strong temptation for peace-loving souls to wash their hands of the whole ghastly business and to feel that Christian idealism justifies this 'great refusal,' Christian morality demands the clear re-statement of the duty of resisting evil, not only on the intellectual and spiritual planes, but also on the physical. It is a Gnostic and not a Christian view of life which here rejects the use of the physical.

Lord Halifax referred to another issue not so commonly dealt with, but deserving of the most serious attention in connection with the education of our young *intelligentsia*. Commenting on the tendency to interpret all human history dominantly in terms of economics, he stressed the claims of the ideal of the perfect individual, somewhat unpopular to-day, as against the claims of the ideal of the perfect system.

'There has been a tendency for great thinkers, who have analysed the social and moral values on which the human community has been built, to stress the need for finding the perfect system. Christianity, on the other hand, has rather made its end the perfection of the individual, in the conviction that here, too, lay the secret of life for all society. And this emphasis upon the ideal system, instead of the ideal individual, has not helped the development of the human character.'

This is profoundly true but is not generally recognized. It might naturally be supposed that those who are so concerned with creating the perfect community would be as deeply concerned with creating the perfect individual. But, curiously enough, this proves not to be so in practice. This is no doubt because it is believed that without a perfect State you cannot have a perfect citizen. In brief, that the perfect State creates, and that it alone can create, the perfect citizen. Hence, all the interest of these young idealists is concentrated on creating the perfect State and in pouring criticism and contempt on all existing States which have not achieved perfection. The realization of the truth that the perfect individual precedes the creation of the perfect State, and is a most important factor in its creation, is ignored; with the consequence that, in not a few cases where community ideals are highest, personal character is very un-

disciplined and undeveloped. Moreover, where the individual idealist finds himself, as of course he is bound to do, existing in a society which is not perfect, he charges his own imperfections, if he has such, to the account of the imperfect society in which he is compelled to live. Thus the imperfect society becomes the great sin-bearer of all the blameworthy individuals that constitute it.

THE MASTER OF BALLIOL ON THE TWO MORALITIES.

Another great layman, Dr. Lindsay, the Master of Balliol, in a small volume — small in size but great in value — makes an important contribution towards the clarification of our moral thinking. This book, *The Two Moralities*,¹ is commended by Archbishop Temple for Lenten reading, and we can conceive of no better book for that purpose in the case of educated men and women. The volume is concerned with the treatment of two different sets of duties, not in direct opposition but constantly confused: the one Dr. Lindsay describes as 'the morality of my station and its duties' and the other as 'the morality of the challenge to perfection, or the morality of grace.'

Bosanquet described ordinary morality as the 'world of claims and counter-claims' — all rights involve duties, all duties secure rights. Dr. Lindsay asserts

'That reciprocity holds, I think, in the morality of my station and its duties, but not in the morality of grace.'

The morality of my station and its duties is on the whole a clear-cut affair — traditional, conventional, pedestrian, and so on — not necessarily easy to perform, often very tedious and exacting, but nevertheless quite plain; and recognized as 'the right thing' by ourselves and those around us. It demands that we should be honourable, conscientious, diligent, courteous, punctual, etc. But the morality of grace is of a different order. It demands 'creativeness and initiative and imagination.'

'In the morality of grace there may be many alternative actions which are equally "right."'

'The morality of grace cannot be codified. There is always a touch of the infinite about it' (p. 48).

¹ *The Two Moralities*. By A. D. Lindsay, M.A., LL.D., C.B.E., Master of Balliol College, Oxford. (Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1940. 3/-.)

‘Mr. Walter Lippmann seems to suggest in his *Preface to Morals* that the acceptance of the claims of this morality depends upon the prior acceptance of theological beliefs. The theological beliefs are as often the result of the acceptance of the moral challenge as the acceptance of the moral challenge is the result of the religious beliefs. “If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching whether it be of God.” It is possible and indeed necessary to discuss the moral problem involved in the relation between morality and religion. Indeed, as Bergson has pointed out, there is a form of religion corresponding to the closed morality of my station and its duties, as there is a form of religion corresponding to what Bergson calls “open morality”—what has been called the morality of challenge or of grace’ (p. 52).

This view of the relation of morality to religion — not viewed anthropologically but practically — is of extreme importance, so it seems to us, in its bearing on Christian reunion, and makes us ask: Why not to-day discard the approach to reunion by the road of dogmatic theology — which is able to record nothing but failure — and tread instead the pedestrian and more fruitful road of moral and spiritual endeavour?

On one point Dr. Lindsay is very clear, and it has a most important bearing on the education of young men and women.

‘The morality of grace then cannot simply supersede or abolish the morality of my station and its duties’ (p. 66).

Nor is it permissible to regard the morality of my station and its duties as of a lower order than the morality of grace so that I may neglect the former in order to devote myself entirely to the latter. The curious and disconcerting phenomenon we observe to-day is that many of those who claim to be obedient only to the morality of the challenge to perfection are often times more neglectful of the morality of my station and its duties than are those who claim to have no concern with the impossible idealisms of a challenge to perfection, but undertake in a most self-sacrificing manner the obligation to discharge the duties of my station. If we are to be loyal to the challenge to perfection or the morality of grace we can only be so if we are first and foremost loyal to the morality of my station and its duties.

‘It is right and fitting that in any society men and women, as they have different gifts, should have different functions, but it is entirely un-Christian to think of one of those functions being morally superior to another. Once I accept it as necessary, for example, that there should be prisons, I proclaim as it were automatically that being a prison warder can be as Christian an occupation as being a bishop or a philosopher’ (p. 69).

We cannot do more here than direct attention to this timely volume. This Age of the Moral Forces, inaugurated by two great wars, is already beginning to transcend the Age of the Mechanical Forces, and as a consequence we anticipate an increasing interest in the solution of moral problems. Towards these solutions, the layman, with his wide experience and practical insight, can make an authoritative contribution. Great Britain is not least great in the fact that its laity have on notable occasions become its great moral and spiritual teachers and that the authentic Christian note is heard at least as often in the House of Commons as in the Church Assembly.

ENGLISH PAGANISM AND ITS REMEDY.

It has been taken for granted by students of English history that we are a Christian nation. We are now waking up to the view that we are very largely Pagan. This note of alarm is struck in a significant leading article entitled, 'Religion and National Life,' which appeared in the *Times* of February 17th :

'Among the incidental results of the evacuation scheme has been the discovery that large numbers of town children are being brought up with no religious knowledge at all. Last Christmas, to take one example typical of many, a country parson asked a class of evacuated children, with an average age of twelve, why we keep Christmas and who was born on the first Christmas Day. Of those thirty-one children, nineteen did not know the answer. Further questions showed that they knew absolutely nothing of the Bible and had never been taught to pray.'

This is serious enough, especially when it can be added to the indictment that a large number of them had never been taught to wash, or if they had been taught, had ceased to practise ablutions. 'This purely heathen upbringing' is indeed a 'grim fact' and a grimy one also. But what is to be done about it? The *Times* finds that the situation is due to a basic fallacy which underlies, not only the popular, but even in many cases, the official conception of education.

'The common argument that while the provision and supervision of "education" must be the business of the State, "religious instruction" must be considered as altogether the affair of the Churches, is not only worthless but mischievous. It is mischievous because it encourages the fallacy that essential education can be completed by secular instruction alone, and that the teaching of religion is merely a kind of optional supplement. The truth, of course, is that religion must form the very basis of any education worth the name, and that educa-

tion with religion omitted is not really education at all. Yet in some of the schools provided by the State there is no religious teaching. In some of the secondary schools it is supplied for the junior pupils only, and dropped, as a subject comparatively unimportant, when they reach the upper forms. Under the system governing the elementary schools it is treated as a subsidiary subject, to be disposed of in a preliminary half-hour before the real work of the day begins.'

All this is indeed true, but it is only half the truth. If it were the whole truth the Board of Education could itself remedy the situation single-handed. There are 'reasons and reasons' why it cannot. These arise from the mixed character of the 'religious problem' in this country.

(1) Parson Thwackum was quite clear as to the definition of religion :

'When I say Religion, I mean the Christian Religion, and when I say the Christian Religion, I mean the Protestant Religion, and when I say the Protestant Religion, I mean the Church of England.'

If our statesmen and ecclesiastical leaders were in agreement with Parson Thwackum, one important difficulty, facing those who desire to make the English people Christian, would have been overcome.

The interesting correspondence in the *Times*, which followed on the publication of the article, indicates the conflict in this sphere. Before a strong advance can be made there must be agreement among all parties as to what is the 'real Christian thing' which it is needful to teach in the schools of the nation. The *Times* truly stated that

'The highest educational aim is to produce good citizens. The basis of good citizenship is character, and a man's character depends upon his beliefs.'

Ninety per cent. of the nation is agreed as to what constitutes a good citizen. They are also agreed upon the question of 'character.' They are not agreed about the 'beliefs.'

Can we get agreement as to these fundamental beliefs by the Heads of the Churches as well as by the national educational authority? If that can be done there is a good prospect of going further forward. But agreed Scriptural syllabuses are not enough here : still less the deceptive remedy of admitting into the schools representatives of every Christian denomination to teach a little group of adherent scholars the *Credenda* of their denominations.

(2) The second great difficulty in solving the religious educational problem is that the Board of Education, the schoolmasters and the schools constitute only one of three fundamental agencies. Besides the school there is the Church and the Home. Christian public worship has afforded, in days gone by, one of the great opportunities of national Christian education. That opportunity is being steadily lost. Church attendance has declined, is declining, and shows no signs of recovery. We cannot here discuss why men do not go to church as their forefathers did. A dozen reasons true for different cases could be cited. The two most popular are the growing secularization of English life: this is the cry of the clergy. The other, the out-of-date character of the Church services, and the obscurantist teaching of the clergy: this is the cry of the laity.

The *Times* charitably asserts that:

‘The Churches have done, and are doing, their utmost to check the decay of religious knowledge, which leads necessarily to the decline of religion itself.’

We hope there is no religious leader or teacher in the land who will lay this flattering unction to his soul.

Then there is the home as the teacher of religion. Most of those who ‘have religion’ got it, not in their school, but in their home. Where there is no religious life in a home there can be little influential religious teaching. The best kind of religious teaching is example and association with religious people, not definite verbal teaching; for as Dean Inge has said: Religion is caught, not taught. This needful religious influence can be supplemented by developing religious habits, *e.g.* saying daily prayers, going to church on Sundays, reading and learning by heart short selected portions of Holy Scripture, hymns and prayers. It is not concerned with theological dogmas but is closely concerned with the Jesus of History: the character, conduct and teaching of our Saviour.

These considerations make it clear that better religious education in the schools is only going to perform a part, and perhaps not the most influential part, in the Christianization of the rising generation. The Church and the Home have each to do much better than they are doing at present if success is to be achieved.

Canon Anson, the father of the present Master of the Temple, remarked when Sunday Schools were established : they will have one result, parents will no longer feel it necessary to bring their children to church.* His prediction has come true.

If the improvement of religious teaching in the schools of the country is not going to be combined with a serious revival of religion in the home and religion in the church, the results will be meagre.

THE NEED FOR RE-ESTABLISHMENT.

What is to be the future of the Church of England? Is she to become an Anglo-Romanist sect longing for, but hesitating to seek openly, admission to the Church of Rome?

There are some hundreds at least of English Clergymen who are definitely working for this end in what they believe to be the best interest of Christian Unity or what they would prefer to call, Catholic Reunion. An exposition of this policy was published on Ash Wednesday in a long letter to a Norwich newspaper over the signature of W. E. Duxson, Rector of St. John Maddermarket, from which we cite the following pertinent passages :

‘My contention is that you can’t have reunion except on the basis of the Catholic Faith and with the Pope. I point this out clearly in order that those keen souls may not find at the end of their toil that the Catholic Church cannot receive them on their own terms. . . .

‘. . . Without the acceptance of the dogma of Papal Infallibility (i.e. that whenever the Pope, speaking to the whole Church in his office as Supreme Pastor, defines anything as binding on the whole Church, either in faith or morals he is divinely protected from error) the reunion of Christendom is impossible.

‘I want to make it clear to all reunionists that if you think that Rome is ever going to receive you on your own terms you are waiting for an event that is never going to happen. On the day when all reunionists exchange “Rome will not” for “Rome cannot” a long stride will have been made in the direction of reunion. The *de fide* dogmatic positions of the Catholic Church are incapable of modification. “Unity of ideals, the common ambitions, and the widespread feeling of ineffectiveness,” cannot bring reunion. Full dogmatic agreement is essential.’

The fact that the Church of England is established is the greatest practical barrier to such reunion. Indeed so long as

* *Looking Forward*, by Harold Anson, p. 83.

the Church of England is established, reunion with Rome is impossible. This fact accounts in no small measure for the persistent attacks made on Establishment by extreme Anglo-Catholics. Unfortunately there are others, not extreme Anglo-Catholics, who by clamouring for Disestablishment, do not see that they are playing into the hands of Rome and are demanding a policy which, if adopted, would not only ruin the Church of England, but eventually the cause of the Christian Religion in England.

It is not without significance that a number of Free Churchmen, although by education and sentiment favourable to Disestablishment as demanded by the claims of religious equality and the realization of the liberal ideal of 'a Free Church in a Free State,' are beginning to recognize the value of Establishment, if the English people are to retain their Christian character. But while favouring the principle of Church Establishment, they are by no means satisfied with our present Church Establishment. They think that an established national Church should in policy and practice be definitely more comprehensive and more representative than is the Church of England to-day.

In a suggestive article, 'Christianity or Chaos,' by the Rev. Reginald Wilde, in the *Inquirer* of February 7th, it is maintained that :

'The solution towards unity lies not in less of Establishment, but in more of it. Sectarianism hopelessly divides the Christian forces just when they need most to be united; breeds infinite confusion in the minds of common men; and wastes and dissipates spiritual energy and activity in a wholly indefensible fashion. The crying need is for a Christian Church, simply as Christian, embracing the whole people of the nation, so that the loyalty of men to the Church (or rather to the great spiritual principles and standards of conduct which the Church exists to serve and teach) comes even before their loyalty to the state, and so that all national policies and statecraft are constantly judged and criticised, shaped and determined, by reference to this one authoritative criterion.

'But just here comes the rub. That Church which, ostensibly, comes nearest to being a "state" Church is reared upon credal bases which affront the intelligence of multitudes of men, and any efforts towards re-union are always prefixed by demands for acceptance of doctrines that no longer have validity or power.

'History, comparative religion, Biblical scholarship, and psychology, have done their work, and it is safe to say that never again will the great multitude of men be able to accept the ancient creeds and formularies of faith. To insist upon these as a basis for the one com-

prehensive state Church is to estrange, at the very outset, a very large proportion (probably a majority) of those whom it is sought to capture, and to alienate many of the most thoughtful and most responsible members of the community.

'Yet common men everywhere are hungry for something that will really redeem and spiritualise life, whilst the most thoughtful see a universal ethic as the one solution to the present chaos. Many outside the present churches are willing to admit that if there is a light of the world at all it is to be found in Jesus Christ, and, like Mr. Bernard Shaw, are persuaded that while all else has failed, His way, which has never been tried, seems the one way likely to succeed.

'Moreover, some of the doctrines which are insisted upon as necessary pre-conditions of reunion have in themselves no meaning or suggestiveness for common practical life. The doctrine of the Trinity, for example, has no bearing upon practical conduct and behaviour. Nor has the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession. On the other hand, there are doctrines which have profound corollaries for everyday living. The Fatherhood of God means the brotherhood of man, and the need for men to act towards each other like brothers. The Incarnation means the life of God within the soul of every man, and so the need for every man to live as a child of the Most High. The doctrine of the Resurrection means, as Paul saw, that each believer must die, in Christ, to a life of sin and selfishness, and rise with him to the newness of a dedicated life, saved from selfishness and assertiveness and materialism.

'In short, it is precisely those doctrines which all earnest Christian men can accept which not only provide the surest and readiest means to a reunion of the churches in England, but which also have most fruitful and most vital application for the life of men and nations.

'It comes, then, to this—that the basis for a really wide and embracing National Christian Church must be at once simple, profound, and practical. Just what form that Church will take, in any particular nation, will depend upon history, circumstances, and native genius. But for England, it will, I think, approximate in many ways to our present Church of England, but shorn of those elements and doctrines which are (as I see it) both non-essential and divisive. The need is for a Church wide enough to embrace all who desire to follow the way of Christ and to acknowledge his lordship over their lives.

'Moreover, it is again precisely those doctrines which are in the New Testament that answer to such a test, while those which are later accretions are not only intellectually suspect, but are also the divisive and (for many) unacceptable ones. To get back to the origins and purity of the faith is to enter a realm where unity and comprehensiveness grow increasingly possible.'

Such a policy of Re-Establishment, based on loyalty to the great moral and spiritual ideals preserved in the New Testament and supremely exemplified in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, is what the existing situation demands. The time is overdue for a New Reformation of religion in this land combined with, and indeed depending in no small measure upon,

the re-constitution of the Church of England. It is no iconoclastic revolution that is needed but a great simplification and spiritualization, which puts first things first. This re-organization is emphatically demanded both in the light of our modern knowledge and in the light of our national needs. It is however a Reformation which cannot be carried forward by niggling policies and timid opportunism. Who of our leaders has the will, the courage and the wisdom to implement it?

THE HARBORNE RITE AND ITS CRITICS.

Canon R. D. Richardson has been vigorously criticized in recent issues of the *Church Times* for his introduction of the Harborne Rite into his parish church. This Harborne Rite, as our readers know, is Canon Richardson's service for the administration of Holy Communion. In using it in the parish church he has not disobeyed the episcopal prohibition, for Dr. Barnes has not prohibited its use. Neither has Canon Richardson, by introducing the Harborne Rite, deprived his parishioners of the Sunday celebration of the Holy Communion according to our Prayer Book of 1662; for the Harborne Rite is only used as an alternative service, supplementing that of the Prayer Book. Neither has the introduction of the Harborne Rite been made in opposition to the wishes of the parishioners; for the consent of the Harborne P.C.C. has been obtained, and the parishioners favour the innovation.

Had Canon Richardson introduced into Harborne parish church a celebration of the Holy Communion in accordance with the ritual and ceremonial of the Roman Missal, the *Church Times* would not have condemned the Canon's action, even though the Harborne parishioners had deeply resented such an innovation in their Church Services. It is not innovation as such in our Church Services that the *Church Times* opposes: it is not the giving of offence to the body of the parishioners that it condemns: it is not the defiance offered to the authority of the Bishop that it deplors. Wherein then does Canon Richardson's offence consist? It is that the Harborne Rite is a Modernist revision of the English Office of the Holy Communion. It is quite true that there are ancient precedents

for a number of the changes introduced by Canon Richardson, but the *Church Times* ignores this. The Harborne Rite, as a whole, is Modernist; that, in the eyes of the *Church Times*, is its offence and justifies its condemnation. Not so long ago we were told repeatedly, and not least by Anglo-Catholics, that Prayer Book liturgical uniformity had broken down. It appeared that there was a growing demand, not simply for the revision of our Church Services by the removal of obsolete archaisms in phraseology and doctrine, but also need for the enrichment of our services, both in the spheres of enlargement and variety. Many additional services were required and many of the older Prayer Book services might be enriched in various ways, *e.g.* an introduction of the *epiklesis* into the prayer of Consecration at Holy Communion, and by prayers for the departed in the Burial Service. Here it appeared that for a season, at any rate, the best method of procedure would be by practical experiment.

This policy, although without formal authorization by the legal authorities, was regarded as being generally accepted at the present time, and so we entered in our English fashion not upon a period of liturgical anarchy but of practical liturgical experiment. In accordance with such a policy it was understood that the authorities would waive the obligations of legal obedience and turn a blind eye, possibly even a sympathetic eye, on practical liturgical experiments: provided of course that such experiments were loyal to the spirit of the English Prayer Book and were carried out with the approbation of the worshipping parishioners.

Canon Richardson, it seems to us, has been loyal to these ideals and is deserving of commendation for his initiative and wisdom. If there is to be freedom for liturgical experiment, and the *Church Times* demands such freedom for Anglo-Catholics, then justice demands that there shall be an equal freedom for Modernist Churchmen.

MAHATMA GANDHI¹

By GAMALIEL MILNER, M.A., author of *The Problem of Decadence*, etc.

MAHATMA Gandhi is, we know, a student of the New Testament. It is possible, then, that when this tribute of congratulations was presented to him on his seventieth birthday, October 2nd, 1939, he thought of the warning of our Lord, 'Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you.' The volume consists of fifty-eight appreciations, all more or less eulogistic; two are from Anglican Bishops, three are from South African politicians whose fathers sent him to prison with hard labour, another is by a cousin of Mr. Winston Churchill who not so many years ago described him as a half-naked fakir. The Mahatma has been more fortunate than the prophets of old, who had to suffer a martyr's death before the children of their slayers built their sepulchres. Lord Brougham was very anxious to read his own obituary notices and spread a report of his death in a carriage accident. He found them disappointing. Junius on one of the rare occasions in which he indulged in praise says of Lord Chatham, 'Recorded honours shall gather round his monument. It is a solid fabric and will support the laurels that adorn it.' Possibly some of these flowery tributes, like the wreaths sent on the occasion of a big public funeral, are really intended rather to bring the sender's name before the public.

Gandhi, however, is quite indisputably alive. Indeed, it is possible that his political career is by no means over. And perhaps, as he reads this volume, he may murmur whatever is the Sanskrit equivalent for the tag, '*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*'. There is always a tendency with conservatives to praise the reformers of the last generation; it is not so long ago that the *Church Times* used to preface an attack on Modernists with some friendly reference to Maurice and Kingsley. And no doubt our much-tried officials in India find Gandhi a much

¹ *Mahatma Gandhi*. Edited by S. Radhakrishnan. (Allen and Unwin. 7/6. 1939.)

Gandhi's Challenge to Christianity. By S. K. George. (Allen and Unwin. 3/6. 1939.)

more genial personality than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. At any rate, Gandhi is now an institution; he embodies India almost as Victoria did England forty years ago.

India has been fortunate in her choice of a Mahatma; we have only to think of certain other national Demigods to feel how fortunate. 'I don't think Gandhi is a clever man,' says Mr. Reginald Reynolds, 'I regard him neither as a Messiah nor as an Avatar' (p. 247). But he reminds one sometimes of Socrates, who used frequently to insist on his want of cleverness; his speech at his trial in 1922 (p. 361) has passages in it which recall the *Apology*.

'I wish to endorse all the blame that the learned Advocate-General has thrown on my shoulders in connection with the Bombay, Madras, and Chauri Chaura occurrences . . . I know that I was playing with fire . . . I know that my people have sometimes gone mad. I am deeply sorry for it, and I am therefore here to submit, not to a light penalty, but to the highest penalty. The only course open to you, the Judge, is, either to resign your post or to inflict on me the severest penalty, if you believe that the system and law you are assisting to administer are good for the people.'

He has done for India what O'Connell did for Ireland and Mazzini for Italy. That the subsequent history of Ireland and Italy might have been profoundly disappointing to those great pioneers, if they could have foreseen it, does not mean that they laboured in vain. India may have to pass through fiery trials before she enters upon her spiritual inheritance, but there will never come a time when her sons will cease to pronounce with reverence the name of the man who first taught them to respect themselves. As Mr. Herbert Samuel says:

'He found a people whose characteristic was oriental submissiveness. To be conquered, to be ruled, to be backward, uneducated, superstitious, poverty-stricken — this was accepted, for the countless masses of the Indian people, as the destined lot . . . Gandhi taught the Indian to straighten his back, to raise his eyes, to face circumstances with steady gaze' (p. 250).

Gandhi is a great Pacifist. As we all know too well just now, this is a term that admits of widely different interpretations. We do not attach as much value as some of the contributors to this volume, English as well as Indian, to what Gandhi calls Satyagraha, a word for which apparently the nearest English equivalent is Passive Resistance. Probably with only a disarmed population behind him it was the best tactics to employ;

it is no good using bows and arrows against people who have got machine guns; it only encourages them to use their machine guns and claim that they acted in self-defence. Mr. Arthur Moore of the *Indian Statesman*, who supplies a refreshing drop of acid to the cup of sweetness, criticizes Satyagraha rather forcibly.

‘It is not a distinctively spiritual weapon any more than is armed rebellion or war . . . In order to gain impetus for a non-co-operation campaign Mr. Gandhi himself has to encourage violent thinking, to denounce the British, to preach against foreign imports. His followers of course went to all lengths in rousing racial hate, and the general result was that probably nowhere in the world was such unrestrainedly violent vituperation to be found, as in the Press and on the platforms of India during a “non-violent” campaign’ (p. 192).

It is possible for a Passive Resister, a Conscientious Objector, to cherish within his own breast and to engender in the minds of others a hatred compared with which the feelings of soldiers in opposing armies toward one another is sane and healthy. Indeed, it is one of the few things to be said for War that the old, honest, stand-up fight did sometimes lead to a purgation of the emotions which might otherwise fester in the consciousness. It is the peculiar glory of Gandhi to have retained the goodwill and even the affection of people to whom he was making himself a confounded nuisance.

It may seem absurd to claim Gandhi as a Modernist. For he says himself, ‘I call myself a Sanatani Hindu’ (conservative). And he goes on to express his belief in the Hindu Scriptures, in caste, in cow protection; he adds, ‘I do not disbelieve in idol worship’ (p. 332). And in his dislike of machinery and industrialism and ‘progress’ he is as reactionary as Ruskin. But he says:

‘Living faith in the mighty God means equal respect for all religions. It would be the height of intolerance—and intolerance is a species of violence—to believe that your religion is superior to other religions, and that you would be justified in wanting others to change over to your faith.’

His attitude to other religions is not one of negative toleration but of positive appreciation. He accepts Jesus’ life and work as a supreme illustration of the principle of non-violence (p. 16). Disapprove as he may of proselytism, he reckons Christian missionaries among his dearest friends.

After all, what constitutes a Modernist, as distinguished from the mere Liberal, is that he is determined to believe in and to practise his own religion while conscious all the time that the great Reality transcends all religious systems. He will not, however much he may be urged to do so by critics to the Right and Left, leave his Church to found a new religion, or remain content with vague sentimental Deism.

In a contribution by Mr. Stephen Hobhouse we have a vision of the future which, gloomy and terrifying as it is, seems to hold out a hope of a happy ending. He envisages a world dictatorship, atheistic and ruthless.

'There will be a widespread and ever-growing refusal on the part of tens of thousands of men and women to become the slaves or tools of despotism; and a Christian Church or Churches, purified by suffering, alongside of purified Buddhist, Hindu, Islamic, and other religious societies, tending ever to draw into a closer intercommunion, will lead a life of intermittent persecution and toleration. (As a Christian I am bound to believe in the eventual world-supremacy of some form of the faith of Christ, but such a consummation may well be delayed for centuries.)' (p. 107).

In the long run the spiritual forces will prevail over the material, and a better world come into existence. In the calendar of the saints of the true Catholic Church Gandhi may well have a place.

It seems hardly fair to treat Mr. S. K. George's book in a postscript, for, slight and unpretentious as it is, it is a book which everyone who is interested in the future of Indian Christianity would do well to read. Not that everyone, or for the matter of that the present reviewer, will agree with all he says. The man who lays down a book with the approving exclamation, 'That's what I've always been saying,' is admitting that for him, at any rate, the book has no particular value. There is an immense amount of missionary literature published at the present day which serves to confirm the prevalent impression that the Church overseas is marching from triumph to triumph. Optimistic talk of this kind is very unfair to our missionaries who—and this is especially true of missionaries in India—are facing a very serious situation. Soldiers at the front know that the Siegfried Line is no laughing matter. Mr. George says:

'The Christian Church lost one of its greatest opportunities in recent years in failing to fall behind Gandhiji in his great movement for

national emancipation on non-violent lines. This failure was largely due to the foreign leadership to which it is still so subservient.'

The Honourable East India Company, says Mr. George in another place, 'showed real insight into the implications of Christianity when they regarded its dissemination as dangerous to their continued domination in the country.' Sydney Smith, sometime Canon of St. Paul's, was most emphatically of the same opinion. He said decidedly in the *Edinburgh Review* a hundred years ago how dangerous it would be to let the natives know what a gap there was between the doctrines of the religion we professed and our practice in the East.

The challenge of Gandhi, after all, has merely hastened a crisis that was bound to come in Indian Christianity. How is the new faith which has come to India from the West to reconcile itself with the age-long traditions of this land of ancient culture?

'Wandering about in Hindu temples with their overwhelming massiveness the realization came to me that nothing will be able to replace those giant structures or the faith they express in granite. The Christian Churches I had seen in India seemed ephemeral in comparison. It was only in England that I felt the same about Christianity. Standing under the dome of St. Paul's, in London, it occurred to me that here was the same phenomenon of a religion going down to the depths of a nation's being and expressing itself in a vastness symbolic of that depth. Christianity can never hope to replace Hinduism in India, just as nothing can replace Christianity in England.'

A very similar problem confronted Christians in Europe during the first centuries of our era. It was solved in part (for its perfect solution lies in the future) by bringing Christianity into connection with older systems of thought. There had been, so the more liberal school of the ancient Fathers held, a preparation for the Gospel; God had revealed Himself to Plato as well as to Moses. For the multitude pagan customs and festivals were christened and given new names. As Sir S. Radhakrishnan says in his Foreword, Dr. Inge regards himself as a Christian Platonist; cannot there be a Vedantic tradition in Christianity? Our author finds encouragement in the World Congress of Faiths under the leadership of Sir Francis Younghusband, which aims at promoting a spirit of fellowship among mankind through religion.

THE MINISTRY OF TRUTH*

III St. John, verse 8: 'Fellow-workers with the truth.'

A WAR, like other events, has a spiritual aspect. It may not be the simple conflict between good and evil, beloved of the romantics, but there will be on the different sides differing spiritual values. Nor does it follow that the values with which the victors begin and continue a war will characterize them afterwards. There have been occasions for good or for evil when the spirit of the vanquished has entered into the soul of the victors. It is, for this reason, part of a preacher's task in time of war to clarify the spiritual issues lest they be obscured or forgotten. To attempt such a task will not be inappropriate on this Sunday of 'Remembrance and Dedication.'

The particular subject on which I would speak is the value of truth and the homely virtue of truthfulness.

The seeking of truth has been one of the foundation stones of our civilization, whether we look back to Plato and follow whither the argument leads or with the Gospel assert our faith in a Holy Spirit of Truth. We honour as the pioneers and the master minds of our civilization those who have sought after truth whether it is a Darwin sitting before the facts like a little child or a Luther facing the hostility of his contemporaries for the sake of the truth that was in him. It is to the disinterested search for truth by students of science that we owe the outstanding practical achievements of our age. Even our sceptical thinkers have borne witness by the vigour of their enquiries and the candour of their writings to the importance which they attach to truth. The labours of the few have had their fruit in the attitude of the many: in our own country the desire to hear both sides of a question has become a national habit, and to call a man a liar an unforgivable insult.

Convinced of the value of truth our forefathers came more hesitatingly to the conviction that the truth was best furthered by a wide liberty of thought and expression. No penalties, they

* Sermon preached by the Rev. Chancellor H. G. Mulliner, M.A., Canon of Truro, before the University of Cambridge on November 12th, 1939.

judged, should discourage truthfulness. This freedom has allowed a drastic criticism of many dogmas, religious and otherwise. To a degree which our forefathers did not foresee it has allowed the destruction of the old faith of Europe, and no new common faith has yet come to fill the void. Did not Senor Madariaga say wisely the other day of the failure of the League of Nations, 'there was not enough faith for so big a Church'? More than this, while this freedom has certainly opened the door to more truth, it has also opened wide the door to those who care not for the truth. There has grown up in Europe a nationalism which has faith only in itself and is indifferent to those spiritual ends, including truth, which the state should serve. The temporary dominance of a critical view of traditional opinion and of a sceptical view of man's mental powers left the more thoughtful barren of clear convictions with which they could have stifled this new barbarism at its birth, while the common man, doubtful of his old beliefs and bewildered by the very variety of opinion, has been inclined to accept the convictions of those who shouted the loudest. In some countries it has not been possible to retain liberty of speech, even in the homes of learning. The consequences are becoming clear. For example, Sir Thomas Holland has called attention to the decline of German scientific research, and observed that 'the neglect of fundamental truth for its own sake must be followed by degeneration in technical efficiency.'

The situation has been rendered worse by the need for propaganda on a scale unknown before. Propaganda need not be evil, if by the term we mean the explanation by a statesman in simple language of the reasons for his policy. This can be done fairly and honestly, though not without difficulty and mutual confidence. Propaganda becomes evil in two ways. First, where there is the suppression of other points of view. Second, where there is the deliberate use of falsehood. Herr Hitler in *Mein Kampf* has a passage in which he describes the political method of the social democratic party in Austria. He says :

'They would select their adversary and on a given signal would bombard him with a regular drumfire of lies and calumnies.'

From the days of the Reichstag fire to the stories of Czech or

Polish persecutions of Germans, it would seem that Herr Hitler's régime has perfected the technique which he here describes. In this evil propaganda the truth has merely a limited value, and accuracy is an occasional tribute paid by ambition to truth. When the national interest will be served there is a glory in lying, and it may be that the biggest lie will prove the most successful. To such propagandists there is no question of casuistry — of special circumstances in which the half-truth or even the lie is justifiable, for to these men lies are always justifiable if the national interest will be served. This nationalism is a god who allows no other worship: truth is taken captive and made a slave of military ambition.

It can of course be argued that such falsehood is inexpedient. It creates so profound a distrust that peaceful relations between nations become almost impossible. 'Put away lying,' says St. Paul, 'for we are members one of another.' Further, truth will out, and the more people learn of the lies which their government tells them, the less their confidence in their government. But it is more than a question of expediency. This indifference to truth and this glorying in lies is a betrayal of our civilization and a sin against the God, who is Truth.

Before we condemn untruthfulness of others, placed perhaps amid great temptations, let us think of the problem of truthfulness in ourselves. Just as in national life there is a temptation to allow national self-interest to overrule the claims of truth, so in our private lives the conflict usually lies between the claim of truth and some motive of self-interest, maybe of gain to wealth or reputation, maybe of fear, or maybe of revenge. Sometimes the motive appears more creditable: we suppress the truth for the sake of the feelings of others. It is indeed hard 'to speak the truth in love,' but we do not succeed when we suppress the truth. Sometimes perhaps what we are pleased to think of as a motive of kindness is but a fear of unpleasantness. Modern psychology by its theories of instinctive tendencies and of the sub-conscious has thrown some light on the motives which actuate us and the manner in which we deceive ourselves. Opinions differ as to the practical helpfulness of this new science: at any rate it underlines the warnings given by the moralists of all ages that we should be on our guard against

varied temptations to falsehood. We have thought of the temptations which beset men of affairs, but those of us called to the intellectual pursuit of truth have no easy ministry. As we try to see the truth we are conscious of the mystery which surrounds our world; we are aware of the frequent deficiency and doubtfulness of evidence; we are aware of the imperfection of the mind as an instrument of knowledge and the fallibility of our judgment. When to these difficulties are added the subtle interplay of prejudice and sentiment, not to mention the coarser motives, who of us is truthful? We may reflect that we should not be troubling about truthfulness unless there was some native honesty in our minds, unless some divine spark had touched our spirits and made us yearn for reality. 'O God, thou hast made us for thyself and our hearts are restless till they find rest in thee.' We rest in the Truth of God, but here on earth in our daily experience, there is a continual conflict from which no man can escape, and in which to lay down our arms is an ultimate defeat. To be 'Fellow-workers with the truth,' we must place the emphasis on the word 'workers.' This emphasis is necessary not only in our personal but in our social and public life: truth cannot prevail without the advocates of truth and of truthfulness. It is not enough for us to sit back on the principle of freedom. If the purpose of the freedom is the prevailing of the truth, the truth needs the continuous support of truth-loving men.

How can we be 'fellow-workers with the truth' in Church and State? Take first the Church. Ruskin in *The Roots of Honour* declares that a soldier has a duty to die rather than leave his post in battle, and the pastor a duty to die rather than teach falsehood. Some would argue that the business of the clergy is to defend the truth revealed long ago and embodied in the doctrines of the Church. But this is based on a misapprehension of the Christian religion which is not only concerned with the truth as God has revealed it supremely in Jesus of Nazareth, but looks also to the Holy Spirit of God who, said Jesus, 'will guide you into all the truth.' Admittedly there is difficulty in this two-fold loyalty of the Christian, loyal at once to the truth as it is in Jesus and the truth as the Spirit would reveal it, though in principle the difficulty is no other than that

which confronts us in every field of knowledge. Admittedly many have felt of late a conflict here, and while some have been carried away by every kind of modern doctrine, others have shrunk from accepting those reinterpretations of the revelation in Jesus to which the Spirit has been leading us, especially through the studies of the Bible, of history, and of other religions.

Difficult though it is to achieve this temper and produce the fruits thereof, yet only, I am convinced, by such a balanced outlook can a renewed Christianity give to Europe the faith needed for its common life. The comprehensiveness of our own Church is here a matter for thanksgiving because it gives living room to those who would witness to the truth be it old or new. This freedom, however, has been chiefly used—and some would say abused—by those who have brought out of their treasure things old and have too often set themselves to discourage things new. The penalty of this backward lookingness has been a steady decline for many years now in the influence of the Church of England in the common life. Surely our Church has too often forgotten that the evangelical injunction to the Scribe of the Kingdom of Heaven was to bring out of his treasure things new as well as old. Too often our Church has appealed to men to find in her a spiritual security from the storms of life as though Jesus had never said that ‘He who would save his life shall lose it.’ Modern men have not, I believe, lost their spiritual nerve but, like their forefathers, are willing to be pilgrims to the city of truth and right. They need not go forth like Abraham, ‘not knowing whither he went,’ but they can adventure like the Apostle who had seen Christ on the Damascus road, and was content to confess that ‘now we see through a glass darkly’ and know only ‘in part.’ Admitting our ignorance as well as our sin, our hope is in God. Only in this pilgrim spirit can we escape from the bondage of the Church’s own achievements in the past and recover that dynamic and creative temper which characterized the Church itself in the course of these very achievements, whether in the Primitive, the Mediaeval or the Reformation periods, a creative temper which is the product of faith, in the Gospel sense of the word. To encourage our own Church to a new faith in the leadership

of the Spirit of truth is one of the ways in which we can all be 'Fellow-workers with the truth.'

Turning to the State, it is in the field of public education that the question of truth is at once most important and most difficult. In educational circles we are acutely conscious of the variety of human convictions, and nowhere is liberty of thought and speech more valued and more vital. The memory of deep conflicts on the religious teaching in the schools is still with us. A few would advocate a secular education in which the teaching of the deeper truths is abolished. To my mind such a secular education is not only a mutilation unfair to the child, but easily becomes the prey of a nationalism which is its own god. A nation must have its faith, a faith not in itself but in something higher and more sacred than itself, and find in its faith its inspiration and unity. Liberty of individual belief must not be pressed so far as to make a common faith impossible. Rather a nation has a duty to teach its faith, be it Roman or Protestant, be it Christian or communist. Our own Education Acts hesitate a little at this point and we suffer from the failure of the Anglican and Free Churches to unite into a truly National Church. Yet in practice it is clear enough that judged by its schools a Protestant Christianity is the common faith of England, and it is a matter for thanksgiving that recent years have shewn improvement in the quality and method of the teaching. This improvement owes much to the work of certain scholars of this University, and I am happy to know that at Oxford there is now a Readership in Religious Education. Just because we are Christian we must keep the principle of freedom, because, amongst other reasons, God often gives us fresh truth through those who dissent from prevailing views. On this principle of freedom some Church Schools survive and have their own contribution to make to our educational system. On this principle, the right of the parents to withdraw their child from the religious teaching is carefully safeguarded, although the liberty of a teacher not to teach, for conscience's sake, a faith he does not believe needs to be clearly established. When, if ever, in England there are not enough Christian teachers to teach this common faith it will be time for the State formally to renounce the title and forms of a Christian nation and to adopt another faith. Meanwhile

let the State bear witness to the truth as it sees it, teaching its common faith in the schools, and keeping always a liberty of conscience. When the simplicities of Christianity are faithfully and competently taught, we can be assured that the foundations are being laid of a truth-loving and truth-speaking people.

Any labours for truth in the State are overshadowed by the war, and all wars bring in Byron's phrase, 'a short armistice with truth.' It has already been emphasized in Parliament that the danger of giving information useful to the enemy must limit the war news to the public. No one will dispute the propriety of this limitation, but we can hope it will not be overzealously observed. There are contrary dangers less frequently emphasized. During the last war my late Bishop and teacher, Arthur Burroughs, wrote :

'The worst and most permanently damaging effects (of the censorship) are, first, the undermining of faith in our leaders themselves — not because we think them incapable or dishonest, but because they impress upon us that they cannot trust us; and, secondly, a diffused and quietly destructive scepticism on the whole subject of the war, which certainly lessens interest in it and is bad for our souls.'

We shall certainly do something to prepare for a just peace if we keep, so far as we may, the flag of truth flying in the days of war.

When the tears of war have damped the fires of nationalism and a chastened Europe looks wistfully again to the virtues of internationalism or federation, it may be worth while to see whether an international ministry of propaganda could achieve a high standard of truthfulness and could make the task of false propaganda more difficult. Hard though such an enterprise would be and slowly though it would have to work compared with doubtful propaganda, it might possibly build up such a reputation for accuracy and impartiality that it would form some check on lying. The reports of the League of Nations not infrequently reached a high standard of objectivity and fairness : it was their weakness to be like Blue Books, too long and too difficult to influence the mass of public opinion. Whether such a suggestion, as I have made, be practicable or not, the principle I am concerned to emphasize is that it is our business as Christian men to devise ways of strengthening truth and defeating falsehood.

To-day we are engaged in a war of which no man can see the consequences. Whether under the Providence of God, we in Western Europe shall achieve by His Grace a new spiritual vision and a renewed common life or whether, also under His Providence, the course of our civilization will follow the pattern of its predecessors and we shall 'die in faith, not having received the promises,' none can say. There is for all of us poignancy and comfort on this Sunday in Dr. Masfield's words in *Philip the King* :

' Man with his burning soul
Has but an hour of breath
To build a ship of truth
In which his soul may sail —
Sail on the sea of death,
For death takes toll
Of beauty, courage, youth,
Of all but truth.'

Truth remains : and we know that if ever mankind is to move onwards on its long march, it will humanly depend on truth-loving and truth-speaking men. Such in our day, God helping us, we would try to be : ' Fellow-workers with the truth.'

JOHN MARTIN CREED

By the premature death of J. M. Creed, Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge and Canon of Ely, English theological learning and liberal Churchmanship have suffered a great loss. The son of an English parson he was in his courtesy, diffidence, conscientiousness and culture a noble example of the learned English clergyman who, if not constituted to be a master of popular assemblies, is yet admirably able to influence those select bodies where knowledge and sound judgment, rather than fiery eloquence, make their appeal.

Creed was in the line of the great School of Cambridge theologians which arose with Lightfoot, Westcott and Hort, and numbered amongst its second generation H. B. Swete and F. C. Burkitt. Although possessed of a body of sound classical learning, Creed's interests were not those of the philologist and textual critic. He was primarily a theologian who recognized that no modern theology could be sound which did not pay serious

regard to contemporary historical research and philosophical speculation. These qualifications fitted him, not only to hold a professorial chair in theology, but also to be a competent editor of our most scholarly of English religious reviews, *The Journal of Theological Studies*. His contributions to theological learning took the form of articles and reviews rather than books. His three most important volumes are his *Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel*, 1930, *Religious Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, 1934, *The Divinity of Jesus Christ*, 1938. Creed's *Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel* is for the student our best English Commentary: it is remarkably clear and concise: its strength is critical rather than exegetical. It makes too light of, indeed, practically ignores, Streeter's Proto-Luke hypothesis: it is indifferent to the contentions of German Form-criticism, and came into existence before Dr. Dodd had made his illuminating distinction between 'Futurist Eschatology' and 'Realised Eschatology.' Perhaps the best and the worst which can be said of Canon Creed's *Commentary* is that he was strongly influenced by Wellhausen.

The English Church in the eighteenth century, equally despised and misrepresented by ecclesiastical enthusiasts of the Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic parties, because it despised enthusiasm as much as it despised ignorance, is worthily presented in its strongest aspect in Creed's and Boys-Smith's *Religious Thought in the Nineteenth Century*. Where the English Church came short in the Age of Reason was not in the spheres of sound learning and clear thinking, but in those of moral sensitiveness and spiritual aspiration. Yet in an age when religious teachers are tempted to seek refuge in mediaeval obscurantism, neo-Calvinism or mystical pietism, to catch the spirit of the eighteenth century in the sphere of religious thought is as exhilarating as a fine view on a spring morning.

Professor Creed's third volume, *The Divinity of Jesus Christ: A Study in the History of Christian Doctrine since Kant*, is as fascinating for the philosophical theologian, as it is for the man of culture. This volume constituted the Hulsean Lectures for 1936.

The opening lecture on the Christology of Romanticism is perhaps the most masterly. How much Church Worship has

been affected by the Romantic Movement is widely recognized; but it is not equally recognized how much Church Doctrine has been affected. With the nineteenth century came a changed conception of the method of Divine Revelation, and this has produced for theological thinkers a changed view of the method of Incarnation. Supplemented by historical research, literary criticism, the scientific view of the Universe, and speculations in modern psychology, the older dogmatic formulations appear to be extraordinarily archaic. Nevertheless they served their day and generation; but, as Dr. Creed recognized, they cannot adequately serve ours: though themselves nigh unto vanishing, the essential truths they sought to preserve, possess eternal values. A good example of Dr. Creed's attitude is contained in the closing paragraph of his sixth chapter:

'The effort of the last hundred years has enabled us to appreciate anew the achievement of the great Christian theologians of the early centuries. Doctrine was made under the pressing necessity of taking up an attitude in face of specific tendencies of thought. In the main the answers which were given protected the Christian religion against disintegration. Not for one moment do we wish that the decision of Nicaea had been different. Even the Chalcedonian definition of the Incarnation, though it wrecked the unity of Christendom and bequeathed a legacy of distracting controversy to the Church, was not sheer calamity, for in the circumstances of the age it provided a certain safeguard to valuable elements in the tradition which powerful tendencies in dogma might otherwise have crushed. But our age is not theirs, and the doctrinal history of the last hundred years does not encourage the supposition that we can treat our problems in their terms.'

The *Modern Churchman* has been indebted to Dr. Creed for valuable articles. One of the most important was contributed by him in July, 1938, dealing with 'Some Implications of the Report of the Doctrinal Commission.'¹ Of that Commission Canon Creed was a most important member and his verdict is worth recording:

'I think it has been our function to promote the coherence and stability of the Church of England by demonstrating the large area of unforced consent among Churchmen of different schools and at the same time to allow for the sufficient elucidation of divergent views where divergence arises. As I close I should like to be allowed to testify to the harmonious temper of our body not only in its agreement but also in its disagreements, and also to the general willingness—indeed the general concern—that serious opinions seriously and re-

¹ Vol. xxviii, pp. 187—193.

sponsibly maintained should receive fair statement. Only when this concern has been recalled can the agreements of the Report be estimated at their proper value.'

His latest contribution to the *Modern Churchman* appeared in our Conference number of last year. Treating the theme of 'Jesus Christ in History and Experience,' Creed presents his readers with an admirable example of the continuity of Christian thinking and the need which each Christian age has to do its own thinking for itself.

Dr. Creed married the daughter of a distinguished English Modernist, Canon A. L. Lilley, and he owed not a little to her interest in his studies and to her laborious tasks of proof correcting and translating.

H.D.A.M.

OBITUARY

FERGUS HENRY WOOD, JAMES ARTHUR DAVIES,
JAMES ROBERT CHARLES WEBB.

The Modern Churchmen's Union has recently lost three very faithful members who will be greatly missed.

The oldest, Fergus Henry Wood, was an undergraduate of Lincoln College, Oxford, in the early eighties, when Mark Pattison was Rector of Lincoln and Liddon was Canon of Christ Church. He was actually in Liddon's rooms when Liddon received a parcel from Bryennios, Patriarch of Constantinople, containing a copy of the *Didache* (or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles) which Bryennios had discovered in the Metropolitan Library in a precious codex which contained, among other documents, the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*. Although Bryennios made this discovery in 1875, the text of the *Didache* was not published until eight years later. Fergus Wood related how perturbed the great Victorian preacher appeared to be as he strode up and down his study reading the Greek text of that Primitive Church document which contributed not a little to the overthrow of the claim of the Monarchical Episcopate to be of Apostolic origin.

The pastoral life of Fergus Wood was confined to London in his earlier days, and in his later years to Caterham and to Tandridge. He was an admirable example of the older type of Oxonian cleric: he was cultured, conscientious and at home with all classes. Brought up as a Tractarian (his private tutor was later Head of Pusey House, with whom he read on Sunday afternoons the sermons of the great French pulpit orators of the seventeenth century), he steadily enlarged his outlook and his ecclesiastical sympathies under the influence of modern learning—turning to scorn with lips divine, the falsehood of extremes.

All regular attendants at the Annual Modern Churchmen's Conferences will regret the absence from their fellowship of the genial presence of James Arthur Davies. We republish here his obituary notice from the *Times*:

'The death of James Arthur Davies, "Macbeth" to a very large circle of old Rugbeian friends, will cause grief to many who have been associated with him in the various spheres of philanthropic work to which he devoted the greater part of his life. In his work for the Rugby Boys' Club, in Notting Hill, in all that he did for needy Eurasians as Secretary of the Friend in Need Society in Madras (recognized by the award of a Kaisar-i-Hind Medal), and, since his return to England, in his whole-hearted work, inspired by well-informed faith for the League of Nations Union, he showed the vigour and moral force which Percival fostered in so many of his Rugby pupils. Perhaps from that source, too, came the strong vein of Liberalism that marked his activities in politics and theology. Long before he became a lively member of the Modern Churchmen's Union he used to spend hot Sunday afternoons discussing religion with Indian friends in Madras. Few understood the Indian students' aspirations and difficulties better than he, and it was not only as Principal of the Law College of Madras that he did much for them. In this country he was a staunch but reasonable defender of Indian political claims. He had a natural preference for the under-dog, but no one in trouble ever applied to him in vain. He was essentially human, and in this, as in his originality and freedom from conventional restraint, he resembled his father, the well-known High Court Judge in Madras, of whom so many stories still survive in India to-day.'

James Robert Charles Webb, B.D., of King's College, London, where he took a first class in theology in 1927, was a promising theological teacher, whose early death is a serious loss to the cause of sound learning in the Church of England. After some parochial experience, interrupted by ill-health, he became in 1930 Vice-Principal of Bishop Wilson Theological

College in the Isle of Man, and Principal in 1931. He resigned this influential post in 1935 to become Vicar of St. Alkmund's, Derby. Notwithstanding much physical weakness he exerted a growing ministerial influence there, and won the respect both of his parishioners and his Bishop. The duties of his position proved too heavy for his frail constitution, and he passed away after a period of prolonged and painful illness early in 1940.

J. R. C. Webb contributed several papers of arresting quality to the Modern Churchmen's Conferences, the most notable of which was 'The Historic Jesus,' delivered at the Oxford Conference of 1936 in a series entitled 'What to Believe.' He valued Form-criticism as making a real contribution to the right understanding of the Gospels, and did not regard it as invalidating the great contribution made by Source-criticism, but as supplementing it. In this he was a disciple of English and American, rather than of German, New Testament scholarship. He will be much missed, especially by our younger members.

H.D.A.M.

BOOK REVIEWS

DR. TEMPLE'S READINGS IN ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL *

The continuation of Dr. Temple's expository 'Readings' in the Fourth Gospel has just been published. The first volume, containing his meditations on the first twelve chapters of the Gospel, appeared about a year ago and was reviewed in the *Modern Churchman* in April last. The second volume, containing his meditations on Chapters XIII—XXI, appears under the same format, and in it is reprinted the general introduction to the Gospel found in the first.

A reviewer must look at a book in the light of the author's intention. He must not complain because it does not do what the writer does not set out to do. Dr. Temple has not written a detailed Commentary. Nor does he consider with critical acumen the many historical and theological problems with which the most spiritual of the Gospels bristles. He writes to 'feed the sheep'—if I may use the figure found in the Epilogue of the Gospel. His own heart and mind have been fed from *St. John*, like many another in the long pilgrimage of Christianity; and he would impart to others the strength he himself has received.

* *Readings in St. John's Gospel*. Second Series: chapters xliii-xxi. By William Temple. (Macmillan, 1940. 8/6 net.)

Thus the easy way to review this volume would be to spend my few paragraphs in generalities. This is a devotional book. How, indeed, could it be other when it deals with the most devotional chapters that have ever been written? When the reviewer has drawn attention to the manifest edifying quality of the book what more is there for him to do?

This, I think. To draw the reader's attention to the fundamental conceptions integral to the exegesis. A mind with the theological strength of Dr. Temple's could not write without revealing these conceptions. Unlike the superficial preacher and journalist, he knows where he is going, what he is saying, and what he is seeking to accomplish. No philosophic theologian could write on the devotional themes which form the substance of the second part of St. John's Gospel without revealing his attitude to issues of great moment to the future of Christianity. This is not to suggest that all readers of the book will be aware of these issues. Some readers, however, will be; and these have a right to know the kind of guidance given by one of the most influential leaders of the Christian Church in this land.

The chapters of the Gospel with which Dr. Temple deals do not raise quite the same controversial issues — *e.g.* that of 'miracles,' on which his views are by this time well known to all competent students of the evangelical narratives — as the earlier chapters. Nevertheless, they raise a few issues of fundamental importance.

The same scepticism as to 'symbolism' in the Gospel, so characteristic of the First Series, is manifest here, though to a lesser degree. Dr. Temple dismisses the many symbolical interpretations of the 'one hundred and fifty and three' fish of *Jn.* xxi with the summary statement: 'It is perverse to seek a hidden meaning in the number; it is recorded because it was found to be the number when the count was made.' On the other hand, the familiar 'blood and water' passage in the account of the Crucifixion is regarded both as historical and as symbolising to the evangelist 'that from the sacrifice of the Cross flows the grace of the two great sacraments.' The attentive reader may wonder at the confident dismissal of symbolism in the one narrative and the confident acceptance of it in the second. Another illustration of Dr. Temple's attitude to symbolism is found in his comment on the 'two angels' of *xx*, 12:

'It is not to be presumed that angels are physical objects reflecting rays of light upon the retina of the eye. When men "see" or "hear" angels, it is rather to be supposed that an intense interior awareness of a divine message leads to the projection of an image which is then experienced as an occasion of something seen and heard.'

Another important issue is the question whether this Gospel is 'mystical' or no. Dr. Temple in his Introduction says:

'In the proper sense of the word "mystical," as signifying a direct apprehension of God by the human mind, St. John is strongly anti-mystical.'

In the body of the exposition he writes :

'So there are two levels of faith possible to us. Best of all is that intuitive faith which apprehends Deity when face to face with it and can accept the claim which its very nature must make.'

I may be misunderstanding Dr. Temple, but I cannot but feel that this 'intuitive faith' is thoroughly 'mystical.' St. John's Gospel is strongly 'mystical' in the Christian sense.

Another kindred issue of the highest importance, not only for the student of this Gospel but for the Christian thinker of to-day, is its 'sacramental' teaching. It is here that the 'Oecumenical Movement' has reached an *impasse*. One careful reader, at least, must express his disappointment that Dr. Temple has not discussed the silence of the Fourth Evangelist about 'the words of institution.' I do not think it is enough to say: 'In that moment the Lord did certain things. What He did is already familiar to St. John's readers. He took the bread, calling it His Body, and broke it and gave it, etc., etc.' I cannot but feel that many commentators are so concerned to *explain away* this silence of the Johannine evangelist that they forget to *explain* it. For his silences are as significant as his additions. Lest this remark may seem ungenerous, I should like to add my warm thanks for the statement: 'Whether or not He commanded us to use this rite, as I believe He did, yet *its significance and power consists in the fact that we do in remembrance of Him what He did "in the same night in which He was betrayed," offering ourselves in the power of His self-offering*' (the reviewer's italics). The Fourth Gospel is more opposed to an *ex opere operato* conception of the 'sacramental' than any other book in the New Testament.

Let me close what I am aware is an imperfect appreciation of a book which quickens heart and mind with a quotation on this very crucial 'Oecumenical Movement.' Commenting on *Jn.* xv, 12, Dr. Temple writes:

'Do we feel such a bond with our fellow-Christians? Is our fellowship in Christ a reality more profound and effective than our membership of our earthly fellowships—family, school, party, class, nation, race—and able in consequence to unite us in love across all natural divisions and hostilities? Of course not. And the reason is that we do not truly abide in Him. If we did, His life of sacrificial love would flow through us all and unite us in the most intimate bonds. What is called the Oecumenical Movement represents a dawning consciousness of this truth.'

It is with a vivid and gracious memory of Holy Communion at the Girton Conference on the morning before its untimely dissolution that I quote these words of the Archbishop of York. And in the light of them I like to think he would have approved of the action then taken by the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union—so instinctive as it was with the spirit of Christian courage and love which animates the whole Johannine Gospel.

Didsbury College, Manchester.

C. J. WRIGHT.

A POET LOOKS AT THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH *

Mr. Charles Williams sees the history of the Church as the record of the operation of the Holy Spirit; and as that is what it must essentially be, the survey is directed from the right point of view, and though by no means free from obscurity it is illuminated by flashes of insight.

The operation of the Spirit is traced under the three conditions of the first century A.D. — Jewish religion, Roman order, Greek intellect — and on through the centuries. The table of dates begins with A.D. 30, 'Ascent of our Lord and Descent of the Holy Ghost,' and ends with A.D. 1939, 'European War: Second period of military operations.'

Mr. Williams has a keen eye for points of special significance. How many people, I wonder, have ever noticed that the year 1534 saw the publication of Luther's Bible, and of the *Institutes* of Calvin and also the foundation of the Society of Jesus? Let it be added that it was in this year that the Supremacy Act was passed, describing King Henry as the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England.

The frontispiece, a reproduction of a painting by Ludovico Brea, represents the presidency of the Holy Spirit over 'the co-inherence of the whole redeemed City,' and suggests the dominant idea of the book. The spectacles and geniuses of the co-inherence are marvellous, but its power is always to be found in its unknown saints, and innumerable honest priests and pious laity labouring in their several callings to the glory of God. It is doubtful, Mr. Williams opines, whether

'Christendom has ever quite recovered from the mass-conversion of the fashionable classes inside Rome and of the barbaric races outside Rome It is at least arguable that the Christian Church will have to return to a pre-Constantine state before she can properly recover the ground she too quickly won' (p. 86).

It is not clear what Mr. Williams means by what he calls 'the polarization of the senses,' and he seems to take bits of esoteric mysticism too seriously; but he has the observation of a true poet and he has a vigorous and attractive style. A few examples of his just remarks may fittingly close this brief review:

'Gamaliel was the first, in Christian times, to utter a maxim too often forgotten by Christians — that there is no need to be too ardent against other people on behalf of Omnipotence' (p. 5).

'The pious, however, then as always, were in a state of high anxiety to defend and protect, and generally stand up for, Almighty God' (p. 219).

'There has never yet been found any method of driving out one devil — except by pure love — which does not allow the entrance of seven' (p. 107).

* *The Descent of the Dove. A Short History of the Holy Spirit in the Church.* By Charles Williams. (Longmans, Green and Co. 1939. 7/6.)

His quotations are apt. Take this, for example, from Montaigne, 'The conviction of wisdom is the plague of man'; and this from Thomas à Kempis, 'The Holy Ghost has delivered me from a multitude of opinions.'

Lis Escop, Truro.

J. W. TRURON:

A CONVINCING CHRISTIAN ANTHROPOLOGY *

It is pretty well agreed that a new Christian anthropology is overdue. During the nineteenth century the traditional anthropology fell into disrepute, partly because of the prevailing 'Pelagian' and liberal ideology, partly because Darwin and the anthropologists had reduced the Genesis story from the status of history to that of myth. But of late years a certain change of outlook has taken place, induced partly by the disturbing revelations of the New Psychology, partly by the even more disturbing events of recent history, both of which render the idea of a 'Fall,' and even of 'Original Sin' neither uncongenial nor altogether incredible. Thus a more favourable atmosphere has been created for the development of a new anthropology which will retain the essential moral values, and also the facts about human nature, which the old anthropology so uncompromisingly embodied. For this reason an exhaustive treatise such as that of Dr. Emil Brunner, Professor of Theology at Zurich, is most welcome and timely; it is a work that is not only closely reasoned and scholarly, but eloquent, original, and (what is not so usual in theological works of this monumental character) highly readable.

Dr. Brunner summarises the Christian standpoint as follows:

'The Christian message of the reconciliation and redemption of mankind contains, as its negative presupposition, the doctrine that man, who has been created in the image of God, has set himself in opposition to his origin, and that it is this opposition which determines the contradiction in his nature, the conflict between his true nature and his actual, empirical nature.'

Everyone knows something of this contradiction in man; both cynic and idealist recognise its existence. In point of fact, evil is 'the open wound where the disease breaks out.' But when the attempt is made to define the origin and nature of the 'contradiction,' opinions vary. Its existence may be attributed to the dual character of our nature (body and mind), or to the survival in us of animal rudiments, or to other kindred causes. But all such explanations account for the 'contradiction' by doing away with personal responsibility. Then there is the purely moral theory whereby evil is made to originate in the free will of man; but this fixes the responsibility on man while no explanation is offered as to why he sometimes chooses evil and sometimes good. In a word, one type of explanation sacrifices responsibility to the 'contradiction,' while the other type sacrifices the 'contradiction' to

* *Man in Revolt*. By Emil Brunner. Translated by Olive Wyon. (Lutterworth Press. 15/-, 1939.)

responsibility. But in the Biblical view both exist and neither can be done away with.

The traditional ecclesiastical doctrine deals with the 'contradiction' under the twofold conception of the Fall and Original Sin. The idea of the Fall attributes the 'contradiction' to apostasy from man's original state; the idea of Original Sin maintains that the 'contradiction' is a determination of man's actual condition caused by the apostasy. Although, in Dr. Brunner's view, this traditional ecclesiastical doctrine is 'entirely relevant and must not be abandoned,' yet he holds that it is weak on the side of responsibility, and its weakness springs from its 'historical' form — which of course is also its weakness from the scientific (*i.e.* biological and anthropological) standpoint. In short, the weakness of the traditional ecclesiastical view is not only a scientific weakness but a religious weakness, which of course is far more important.

But where exactly does its religious weakness lie? It severs, says Dr. Brunner, the two things which must at all costs remain united — necessity and responsibility. By attributing the 'contradiction' to the historical lapse of Adam, and then by finding the unity between Adam and his successors in a non-personal fallen human nature, Adam's successors are (logically) relieved of responsibility. We sin because of our fallen nature, but this was due to an historical event in which we had no share. Thus the 'contradiction' is admitted, but the responsibility is evaded. It was not that Augustine was wrong as against Pelagius; on the contrary, he was right, and Pelagius would have destroyed Christianity, as Harnack admitted. What Augustine wanted, and what he defended against Pelagianism was (to quote Dr. Brunner) 'the unity of inescapable necessity and responsibility which cannot be shaken off; sin as a totality which determined the person, and at the same time sin as a personal act.' But are the two things, necessity and responsibility, compatible? Can Augustine have it both ways? The Biblical teaching at any rate, according to Dr. Brunner, includes both, and to sacrifice either is to abandon that teaching.

Dr. Brunner finds the key to the difficulty (and the foundation of a new Christian anthropology) in the teaching of Kierkegaard, who said that 'Man whom God created is always both this individual and humanity.' The isolated individual is an abstraction. Each soul, by creation, is related to (1) its Creator, and (2) to its fellow human beings. Sin, according to the Biblical teaching, both in the New Testament and the Old, consists in revolt, a desire for 'independence,' 'freedom,' and to be masters of ourselves. Not only Adam, but the Wicked Husbandmen (who wanted to be masters) and the Prodigal Son (who wanted to be independent) were actuated by the same motive. They wished to cut themselves off from that dependence on what in reality was essential to their nature and perfected it, and this could not but debase their nature.

‘ In the Creation we are an individualized, articulated unity, one with many members. We are a unity bound together in a solidarity, in a mutual responsibility which is to be understood not as a task but as a gift, as a God-given life, not as an aim to be realised by us in the future, but as our Creation and Beginning in God. God has created us as this whole — so that only and precisely in this being-in-the-whole can each become that for which he is destined, a responsible person, a human man.

‘ If that is our origin, then our opposition to this origin cannot be an experience, an act, of the individual as an individual. The sin of Adam is the destruction of communion with God, which is at the same time the severance of this bond ; it is that state of “ being against God ” which also means “ being against one another.” Certainly each individual is a sinner as an individual ; but he is at the same time the whole in its united solidarity, the body, actual humanity as a whole.’

But no extracts can do justice to Dr. Brunner’s exposition of this crucial theme. The book is a solid piece of reasoning throughout, besides being full of the most illuminating passages. If, instead of frittering away time on the newspapers, a clergyman would get hold of this book, which is cheap at 15/- (there are 564 pages), and read it carefully and systematically, he would find himself not only a better-informed, but a wiser, man at the end of it. This noble essay in Christian anthropology will make the very best kind of war-time reading. The topic is most appropriate.

J.C.H.

JOTTINGS OF AN EARLY REFORMER*

Thomas Bilney was one of a group of Cambridge scholars who, in the second decade of the sixteenth century, used to meet at the White Horse Inn for the discussion of those problems which the new learning of the Renaissance had raised for traditional theology. Included among their number were Latimer, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, and Matthew Parker, the future Primate. It soon became clear that the group had ‘ dangerous ’ tendencies. Bilney himself, after two previous trials and a year in prison, was finally condemned by Convocation on a charge of heresy and distributing forbidden literature, and burned at the stake in Norwich in 1531.

For the most part he is a shadowy figure, and only a few letters and papers, published in Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, are known to have survived. To these meagre remains Mr. Batley has now added a selection of *Adversaria*, or notes, which Bilney wrote in the margin of his Vulgate (now preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge). Although emendations of the text are not uncommon, Bilney can hardly be said to have been interested in textual criticism as such. Consequently his comments are of more value to the historian of the Early Reformation than they are to the textual critic.

* *On a Reformer’s Latin Bible* : being an Essay on the *Adversaria* in the Vulgate of Thomas Bilney. By J. Y. Batley. (Deighton, Bell and Co. Ltd., Cambridge. pp. ix+55. 1940. 4/- net.)

He is revealed as a man zealous for right and just dealing, who deplores the existing corruptions. Custom may not be blindly followed. There is no certain guidance in 'the voice of the Church,' which, however united and dogmatic in its teaching, is none the less liable to error. Images and incense are called in question, though auricular confession is approved. For just cause a king may be rebuked. And the clergy must be faithful in the trust committed to them—beside Numb. xxii.18 ('If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God') Bilney writes 'A saying fit for a pastor.'

Mr. Batley has very properly included in his book only a portion of the available material by way of illustration. A typed copy of all the *Adversaria* is in preparation and will be placed in the library of Trinity Hall, of which Bilney was successively student and Fellow.

H. F. D. SPARKS.

THE SPHERE OF THE CHURCH AS A SOCIAL WORKER *

There is a widespread awareness among Christians in these days of the importance of the social structure and of the community life which that structure expresses and makes possible. It is seen that here is a field for Christian witness which has immense potentialities for good or evil. If, however, Christians are to influence it for good they require knowledge in addition to enthusiasm and devotion, or else the wise have to spend half their time undoing the mischief wrought by the pious. With this in mind, Mr. Blackshaw has reprinted lectures given to ordinands at vacation courses in Mansfield House University Settlement in East London.

In order to act intelligently as Christians in society we have to approach the problem from two angles. First we must know the forces moulding society, who makes decisions in politics and industry, and how the power is gained and exercised which makes our social structure what it is. This involves a study of government, factory management, Trade Unionism and the like. Secondly we require to know, assuming the present structure of society, what modifications are made in it by the compulsory social services of the State and by those of voluntary agencies. Unfortunately there is no simple guide in the first and more difficult of these approaches, though there is plenty of material for Christians who have the time and interest to master it. Mr. Blackshaw has confined himself entirely to the second. Here the State has taken over, quite rightly, much of what has been done in the past by the Church, and two problems are thus raised. What is the relation of the State to voluntary 'secular' social service, and what is the relation of the parson and Church worker to them both? The author keeps these in mind throughout. He is descriptive and accurate and covers the whole range of Local Government, Education, the young offender, the Poor Law,

* *The Community and Social Service.* By William Blackshaw, M.A., B.Sc., B.D. (Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons Ltd. pp. 266. 1939. 7/6 net.)

Public Health, Housing, Factory Acts and Health Insurance down to October, 1938. There is a useful section on delegated legislation, which has caused much discussion since Lord Hewart published *The New Despotism* in 1929. It is a great convenience to have all this necessary information in handy form. No one would want to read through it systematically, but it is well worth while clergy and social workers noting or possessing it as a work of reference. It will save their time and prevent them from making many blunders.

The general tone is rather uncritical, and many will not share Mr. Blackshaw's complacency about our chaotic social legislation and social services. There are no references in the text or bibliography, for instance, to the excellent P.E.P. reports such as those on health, and the entrance to and exit from industry. Again, many of the wider reflections in the Introduction are of a debatable character. Indeed the statement that 'In some European countries when men disagree they want to shoot each other. In England they have a round of golf or dine together' would certainly qualify for the 'This England' column of *The New Statesman*. RONALD PRESTON.

THE SEER OF PATMOS*

Dr. Scott is the author of numerous works of New Testament criticism, readers of which will find the present work worthy of its predecessors. Studies of the *Apocalypse* may commonly be divided into the learned and the lunatic. Dr. Scott's exposition is marked by his customary lucidity, and no extravagant theories are advanced. There are many books on the *Apocalypse* in English, and in this year alone Dr. Vacher Burch and Canon C. E. Douglas have produced massive elucidations, if that be the proper word to describe such laboured productions. Apart from Archdeacon Charles' commentary and subsidiary works on the same theme, the scholarly reader will probably still find Professor Peake's *The Revelation of John* (1919) the best book on the subject, but for the general reader, and still more for the preacher intending to deliver a course of Advent addresses on the *Apocalypse*, Dr. Scott's book will be the most helpful.

The first half of the book, containing the introductory matter and the summary and explanation of the text, is better than the second, which treats of its theology, its relevance to the present day and its literary value. The attempt to interpret Revelation from the standpoint of the theology of crisis is a little surprising in a Liberal Protestant like Dr. Scott, and the suggestion that Domitian was not unlike Hitler and that Patmos had a flavour of the concentration camp will not read well in later years. We are all familiar with the preachers who in the endeavour to be more than merely expository inform their congregations that the life and message of Jonah or Habakkuk have a special interest and meaning at the present day, and then

* *The Book of Revelation*. By E. F. Scott. (S.C.M. 1939. 6/-.)

proceed to draw a series of forced and unconvincing parallels. Dr. Scott in his preface ventures to affirm that 'the message addressed to the church of Asia at the end of the first century has a direct relevance to the conditions of our own day.' The difference between Asia Minor at the close of the first century and the contemporary situation is that John was expecting a collapse of the persecuting Roman Empire, in which he anticipated the event by nearly four centuries, and that the world to-day is undergoing a real collapse. To-day the church is in danger not so much of being annihilated by persecution as of being abandoned or discredited. Dr. Scott affirms (p. 175):

'At the present day, more clearly perhaps than ever before, we can read the message of John as if it were spoken directly to ourselves. By one of those strange reversions which sometimes come about in history, the situation for which the book was written has repeated itself almost to the letter. It was taken for granted, not so many years ago, that this was quite impossible. For most of the evils condemned in the New Testament we could still find modern equivalents, but those which meet us in *Revelation* seemed to have been definitely overcome. There could never again be a time when Christianity would be persecuted, when human beings would lay claim to divine honours, when the very existence of a moral order would be denied. It was in view of such conditions that *Revelation* was written, and it was therefore commonly regarded [by modern scholars] as a book of the past. The Church in this modern day was confronted with new problems, which required all its energy, and was bidden to forget those ancient ones which could never trouble it again. But they have all come back, exactly as they were when John knew them. Satan, thrust into the pit and bound for a thousand years, has mysteriously returned.'

To this it may be replied that the dictators so far have not claimed divine honours, that Macchiavelli and Mandeville denied the existence of morality long ago, that the persecution of Christianity is not a novelty in ecclesiastical history since New Testament times, that the Roman Empire was not a totalitarian state; it did not seek economic autarchy, was not nationalistic or racial and did not aspire to further conquests.

The Eastern Church for long hesitated to admit the *Apocalypse* to the canon of Scripture, and, in view of the aberrations of its interpreters, this might have been the best course: scholars would indeed have lost an interesting specimen of apocalyptic literature, but little of religious or literary value would have disappeared. The labours of scholars have reduced the Apocalypse to intelligibility, but in so doing they have deprived it of its fascination.

P. R. SMYTHE.

DIAGNOSES AND REMEDIES

When our Government subscribed to the Munich Settlement Canon Cockin suffered a very severe shock. He felt that the Munich agreement was a *débauché*. The crisis of which it was the climax displayed us as unprepared materially and mentally, irresolute and undecided about our aims,

selfish to the point of stupidity. So he diagnosed the situation. He has propounded his remedies in a booklet¹ which shows on every page marks of the tension under which he wrote it.

We were unprepared because we suffered from a general intellectual apathy which incapacitated us from dealing effectively not only with international affairs, but with domestic affairs also. We repeated catch-words whose implications we did not realize. Canon Cockin is convinced that the only remedy is that we should get right down to fundamentals; the method he suggests is that we form ourselves into small groups, each of which shall make an honest and determined effort to get at the essential facts of the contemporary position. We must try thus to 'clear up our thinking' on the urgent questions which involve us as citizens. He also stresses the primary importance of action, however limited in scope. The members of his 'cells' must undertake some specific practical work.

'If the State does make a large-scale demand for national service it is safe to say that the most valuable recruits will be those who have served their apprenticeship in all kinds of voluntary associations.'

Though Canon Cockin looks to the Church as our only hope, his view of the present condition of the Church is the reverse of rosy. For the moment the best it may hope to do is to get back to first principles, and to limit its activities to a somewhat narrow sphere. 'We are called to set ourselves to a few tasks which we know to be our true business.' It is emphatically *not* our business to protest against the evil deeds of other nations or their relapse into paganism or their persecution of Christians. It behoves us to start nearer home. The position has changed since Canon Cockin wrote his book. It is now tragically clear that under modern conditions the bonds which unite races and nations are so multifarious and inextricably interwoven that it is impossible to draw a sharp dividing line for any purpose between matters of domestic and matters of international concern.

In his exposition of the situation and of the appropriate remedies Canon Cockin uses language which suggests that the human and the divine are disparate:

'It is, indeed, our duty as citizens to try to clear up our thinking on a number of really urgent questions which involve our responsibility. But it is our very existence as Christians to know where we stand in face of God's question: "Are you going to build your civilization on my truth or on your own?" and to be able to give an answer, because we know what God's truth is.'

As rhetoric this is all very well; but it is tainted with a dualism which is fatal to thought and effort. The antithesis to God's truth is not human truth. It is error. Every human truth is from God. If there are the two kinds of truth, the attempt to clear up our thinking, which, presumably, is

¹*What Does 'A' Do Next?* By F. A. Cockin. (Published by the Student Christian Press. 1939. Price 1/- net.)

human thinking, is simply not worth while. A similar depreciation of God-given faculties appears in the statement that 'We acknowledge the bankruptcy of human intelligence and good intentions to save us from ourselves.' It is, on the contrary, the absence of intelligence, it is evil intentions which have brought Christendom to its present pass. Hitler's racial theory is not an intelligent one, nor is it very intelligent of him to suppress all freedom of thought in the Reich. Nor is Stalin's attack on Finland motivated by good intentions. A truer diagnosis of our present discontents is that in certain regions of thought and action intelligence and good intentions have been swamped by an emotional pseudo-mysticism which, in fact, has its counterpart within the sphere of religion and theology.

Another diagnostician, Dr. R. A. Chaput, writing from the standpoint of the historian, agrees with Mr. Cockin that good government among states and good government at home are interrelated. He pleads, however, for patience, and thinks that the Christian, who possesses or ought to possess a sense of eternity, can afford to be patient. In a booklet² which he has contributed to the *War Time Discussions* series issued by the S.C.M. Press, he surveys the period between the Treaty of Versailles and the outbreak of the present war, indicates the points where we took the wrong turning, and points the moral which we must draw from the past if we are to build a better world in the future. He envisages the problem which faces us as essentially the problem of government, the kind of government which can and will maintain right and justice and freedom.

'Great Britain has secured a dominating position in Europe. She has reaped the benefit of this position. She must also bear the responsibilities. Upon every British citizen rests the decision as to how British power shall be used, whether selfishly or for the benefit of the world. If he is aware of the needs of Europe for good government and faces the difficulties honestly, he can help to bring about the rule of law and justice in the world. If he is content to live his own life in ignorance of world problems and to escape responsibility in obscurantist provincialism, then, as a citizen, he is shirking his duty to the State, and, as a man, his duty to God.'

From the time of Bismarck the German State was essentially a power organization, its policy the Prussian policy of power made effective by military pressure. It reduced all politics, whether domestic or international, to a conflict of power. That was the fundamental cause of the war of 1914-1918. Dr. Chaput holds that nothing is truer than that from 1914 to 1918 the Allies were fighting to end war and 'to make the world safe for democracy.'

'Making the world safe for democracy meant in effect making the world safe for the United States, Britain and France. If these nations were made safe, not only they but the whole world would benefit.'

The terms of the Armistice gave the United States and Britain the security

² *The Road to War and the Way Out*. By Rolland A. Chaput, M.A., D. ès Sc. Pol. (Published by the Student Christian Movement Press. 1940. Price 9d.)

they desired. Dr. Chaput, though recognizing that the Versailles Treaty had grave defects, agrees with Mr. Gathorne Hardy that 'there has seldom or never been constructed a peace of a more idealistic character.' It, however, failed to give democratic France the safety which the Allies and the United States had placed in the forefront of their war aims.

An essential factor in Dr. Chaput's reading of the course of subsequent events is his conviction that the change from the Hohenzollerns to the Weimar Republic was not nearly so radical as some fondly imagined. Civil Servants imbued with Prussian traditions were in the saddle; the pre-war aims and methods persisted. France realized this; Britain did not; the United States washed her hands of the whole business. So he traces the sorry story of the re-emergence of the old Prussianism in a new and debased form and of its renewed bid for world domination. Again we are fighting 'to re-establish the respect of law and justice in human relations, and to free the world from the constant menace of war resulting from the systematic pursuance of power politics.' Our ultimate task will be 'the firm establishment all over Europe of decent behaviour and the translation of these principles into rules and regulations for the conduct of State policy.'

It will not be an easy task. It is not a task from which the Church has any right to disinterest itself, for it involves the preservation and restoration of Christian values. Canon Cockin's suggestion that Christian 'cells' or groups should be formed might well be adopted. It is no longer even plausible to suggest that they should not concern themselves with international affairs. On the contrary, these will needs be their primary interest. There is no reason why such a group should not be established in every parish. Each section of Dr. Chaput's book is followed by a number of 'Questions for Discussion,' and a group could hardly do better than to adopt it as a text-book. The leader of the group should study some standard work such as Seton Watson's *Britain and the Dictators*, and at least one member should familiarize himself with Zimmern's *Spiritual Values and World Affairs*. Other material could be obtained from the still increasing series of *Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs*. Thus equipped the group would form a real school for education in Christian citizenship.

The S.C.M. Press has issued another very timely booklet.³ It is by Dr. G. L. Russell, and it deals with problems of sex. As Dr. Russell says, 'war is a destructive business; and it destroys a lot of things which are out of range of the guns.' Among the things which it threatens with destruction are our standards of sex ethics. He is sure that 'the ethic we commend must win an intellectual assent; otherwise it will perish.' It is of no use to appeal to ecclesiastical tradition and authority. Christian moral standards are not arbitrary. 'This is not true because the Church teaches it; the Church teaches it because it is *true*.' In writing his book, Dr. Russell had

³ *Sex Problems in Wartime*. By G. L. Russell, M.B., Ch.B. (Published for the Church of England Moral Welfare Council by the Student Christian Movement Press. 1940. Price 1/- net.)

specially in mind the problems with which Chaplains to the Forces have to deal in the course of their ministrations; but it merits the attention of all who are concerned with the moral welfare of men and women, in peace time no less than in time of war. It is simple and direct. In it we find the wisdom of a physician of the body conjoined with acute moral insight and a deep and sympathetic understanding of human nature. It is one of the best books of the many which have been written on the question of sex. In some respects and for some purposes it is perhaps the very best.

G. L. H. HARVEY.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

SIR, DR. COULTON AND PAPAL TOTALITARIANISM.

In your kind notice of my article in *Fact* of last June there is a natural slip which it is important to correct. You say that I have 'submitted them to a number of R.C. authorities of whom not one has denied their accuracy.' This is no longer correct. The *Catholic Herald*, having reviewed the article, challenged me to submit it to criticism by the Bellarmine Society located at the Jesuit Collegium Maximum of Heythrop. The Editor has since protested that the suggestion which led to this challenge was not serious, and indeed the result has been rather ludicrous. This society, constituted for the express purpose of correcting anti-Roman statements in the periodical press, took fifty-two days not to answer my express challenge, but to make up their minds whether they would try to answer it. Having finally decided to do so, they first tried to secure their retreat by stipulating for freedom to deny my right of publishing the discussion. Finally they broke off negotiations entirely because I refused to suppress two-thirds of my original article in my republication. If this sounds like a scene from Gilbert and Sullivan, your readers may verify these statements in the full correspondence, which may be had for threepence, post free, from me at 90 Kimberley Road, Cambridge.

G. G. COULTON.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

February 20th, 1940.

SIR, A FIXED EASTER AND CALENDAR REFORM.

In the interesting section of 'Signs of the Times' dealing with a fixed Easter and calendar reform, which appeared in the February issue of your journal, you quote a well-known M.P. as saying that all that is needed is an Order in Council. That may be technically correct as far as the fixing of Easter is concerned, but at the time of the passing of the Act, which did not deal with the reform of the calendar as such, the Government gave an undertaking that regard would be given to any opinion expressed by any Church or Christian body before such an order was drafted.

The attitude which the Church of England seems to have adopted is that without the agreement of all the Christian Churches no alteration should be made. The attitude of the Church of Rome was first supposed to be one of willingness to sanction the proposed change provided there was a practically unanimous request to that effect from the principal Governments of the world, but when the relevant League of Nations Committee passed a

practically unanimous resolution in favour of Easter Stabilisation in 1931 it was reported that the Nuncio at Berne had intimated that the Holy See did not consider that there was sufficient reason for changing what had been the perpetual usage of the Church and that the Holy See would in any case not be prepared to consider the question except on the advice of an Oecumenical Council.

As will be seen from the above, we are so far only concerned in the proposed fixing of Easter. As to Calendar Reform, without which such fixing seems impossible, in January, 1937, the Council of the League endorsed the draft Convention for the Reform of the Calendar submitted by the Chilean Government, but at the meeting in September, 1937, information as to the views of the Vatican was given by representatives of several countries, and as a consequence the Committee considered it inexpedient to recommend the carrying out of the proposed reform.

The fixing of Easter is demanded by public opinion in this country and has found expression in an Act of Parliament, but it is admitted, apparently also by the Vatican, that the stabilisation of that movable feast cannot be separated from a reform of the calendar. It is to be hoped that an energetic Member of Parliament may press for the reform by moving the extension of the existing Act and get it passed. Once this country has adopted a reformed calendar, as recommended by the World Calendar Association of New York, to which the Rational Calendar Association of London is affiliated, the world, including all the Churches, should soon follow.

Tyringham, Bucks.

FREDERICK A. KONIG.

March 1st, 1940.

SIR,

THE BANKRUPTCY OF PACIFISM.

Perhaps you will allow me to attempt a reply to the letter of 'A Practical Peace-maker' in your last issue which seems to me both understanding and helpful. Surely, if we are to get out of this vicious circle of recurring wars, we must find some means other than war of dealing in future with a person like Hitler and groups like the Nazis? I think 'Peace-maker' and others who are not pacifists would agree to this.

In reply to his letter I would say three things.

1. It is difficult to discuss until one defines terms. He asks: 'What better could we have done . . . on September 3rd, 1939?' Who are 'we'? His letter seems to show that he thinks someone blundered in regard to the Treaty of Versailles and when Japan invaded Manchuria. I should say that it was on account largely of this blundering that a state of affairs arose which made our Prime Minister feel that he could not do otherwise than declare war. But if the members of the League of Nations had gone only so far along the road to pacifism as Arthur Henderson would have led them they would not have made the blunder over Manchuria and would have done more to repair the blunders of Versailles.

2. The pacifist may seem negative when he keeps on harping on the theme that war is wrong. But there is a mass of literature which attempts to state our position positively. An analogy may be helpful up to a point; it is taken from the dealings of the Church with cannibal tribes in Melanesia. No one would deny that cannibalism is abominable, and a case could have been made out for sending an armed force and exterminating the cannibal tribes. Instead of this, the Church sent out missionaries. Some were martyred, but in the end the tribes were won to a more civilised way of life. The history of the Quakers supplies other examples of the pacifist way.

There is also the case of Dr. Pennell on the North-West frontier of India, who went unarmed among them and was declared by Lord Roberts to be worth a battalion of soldiers.

3. The case for the present war rests partly on the assumption that this war has been made for the lofty reasons which inspire 'Peace-maker.' There are grounds for qualifying such a judgment. I count myself a pacifist, but I confess that at times my blood boils that we are doing so little to help the heroic Finns. A broadcast of Mr. Churchill's was taken by many neutrals as an invitation to them to bear the brunt of the fighting while we conserved our forces for our own preservation. I should find myself tempted to abandon my pacifism if I could see convincing signs that our Government shared 'Peace-maker's' outlook.

F. E. A. SHEPHERD.

Birmingham.

February 23rd, 1940.

SIR,

I have read with interest Mr. F. E. A. Shepherd's friendly letter, but I do not feel that it is a reply to the question, 'What better could we have done under the circumstances which existed on September 3rd, 1939?'

Certainly I agree that we should seek for some other means than war for dealing with international disputes, but I believe that the way is to create a condition of society when such as Hitler have no chance of getting a following. Such a society can only be formed on a sound moral basis, for which I personally believe religion, and more especially Christianity, is necessary, and the basis for such a society has to start in our own lives. When our present very imperfect society has caused such as Hitler and the Nazis to become powerful factors in international affairs I do not see what other method can be used successfully against them but that of force. I agree entirely with Dr. Niebuhr's letter quoted on page 603 of the *Modern Churchman* for February, 1940, and would suggest that Mr. Shepherd should read Dr. Niebuhr's letter in full.

I think that my previous letter makes it clear that 'we' means the nation, but it also embraces the individual. I do not consider that any particular individual 'blundered' in regard to the Treaty of Versailles and when Japan invaded Manchuria. The opinion of the majority in this and other countries concerned approved of the action that was then taken. Furthermore, this same opinion did not approve of Henderson's policy. (I might add that I did personally *at the time*.)

The analogies of the various 'uncivilized' people I do not feel apply to present-day Germany, which has deliberately turned its back on Christianity and glorified the doctrine that Might is Right. The cannibals were not in a position to overrun the world and had never known anything better than eating human flesh. It was quite justifiable for individuals to go to them at the risk of their lives and show them something better, but it would not have been justifiable to have let them become a general menace. The Red Indians were often willing to live in friendly relationship with whites when they felt they were getting a secure deal and therefore were willing to tolerate the small Quaker settlement. Dr. Pennell and other individuals since, both missionaries and civil servants, have done excellent work, unarmed, on the North-West frontier, but I do not accept that as an argument that when the frontier tribes invade the Punjab they should not be resisted by force from plundering the countryside. If these analogies prove anything, I think it is that pacifists as individuals or as groups are justified in going and settling in Germany and trying to convert the Germans, and of course

suffering the consequences of their actions as the German pacifists have already done.

As for Mr. Shepherd's third point, I feel I should be as much justified, or rather as little justified, if I said that I did not join the Peace Pledge Union because everybody in it was not as sincere in their views as he is. Personally I am quite convinced that the P.P.U. is playing into the hands of the Nazis, whether they are aware of it or not, and that every pacifist in this country rejoices the Fuehrer's heart. This country is engaged in a life and death struggle. There is not room for democracy and totalitarianism. Have we got something more valuable to defend than peace?

'In the midst of militaristic madness that threatens to destroy civilization, enshrined in the British Empire are the things of good report, of which the English-speaking peoples are the custodians for the future of mankind. It is these we are asked to defend, and there is only one answer. That answer has been given resolutely, with a full knowledge of all that it entails and without fear of the final outcome.' (*Searchlight on Europe*, by John de Courcy. Eyre and Spottiswoode. Just published.)

In conclusion, I would add that a Dutch pacifist friend of mine wrote to me a few weeks ago that he had to admit that the Allies were fighting for the small neutrals.

A PRACTICAL PEACE-MAKER.

TRADITIONAL CHRISTIANITY AND A WORLD RELIGION.

SIR,

I should be grateful if you would allow me space for some comments on Mr. Bulcock's important article in your November number on Christian Experience and Speculative Doctrinal Expression. Mr. Bulcock carries us straight to the point that nearly a century of Biblical criticism has reached, and boldly gives utterance to those decisive questions that students of Christian origins are asking to-day. 'Why did men weave these speculations round this particular figure? . . . Why did they associate *Jesus of Nazareth* with their experience of a Divine inward life and power?' (I omit his reference to Paul because the particular circumstances of his conversion somewhat complicate the issue raised in this letter.)

Mr. Bulcock had already anticipated his own answer in another question, 'What grace and truth were his to make them feel that those who had seen Him had seen the Father?' Isn't that rather like asking a man when he is going to give up beating his wife? He speaks of a Jesus who made so great an impression on His immediate followers; but it was not these disciples who carried the message of the coming of the Kingdom all over the Mediterranean world. The late Dr. Streeter has pointed out that nothing is heard of nine of the twelve Apostles after the crucifixion. As is well known, the Messianic Christianity within the Law inaugurated by some of the immediate followers of Jesus at Jerusalem endured for little more than a generation.

But there is another answer, unpalatable indeed to Institutional Christianity, but one that is forcing itself on the attention of many of the laity who have followed the course of New Testament criticism. It can be briefly and very crudely stated as follows:—

- (1) That the Realities of the Christian faith are inner experiences of the growing Soul.
- (2) That these experiences, and the rites in which they were symbolized, were the true bonds of unity round which doctrine developed.
- (3) That these inner Realities were progressively and, finally, synthetically interpreted in terms of the cosmological conceptions of the Hellenistic age.
- (4) That the account of the life and teaching of Jesus in the New Testa-

ment is very largely pious conjecture, an ideal portrait built up by oral tradition, stories told and retold under the influence of preconceived ideas, and quite unreliable as a historical record of the life on this Earth of the Incarnate God.

(5) That the association of these speculative interpretations of inner experience with an obscure preacher of Jewish Messianism is due to contingencies, partly historical and partly psychological, not uncommon in the history of religion, but intrinsically irrelevant to those Realities of inner experience.

To make this clearer, may I quote what I wrote in the *Hibbert Journal* of April, 1937 (with a slight adaptation to the present context)? 'Of the various gospels about Jesus, the first originated in the minds of some of those who had been his companions and disciples during his lifetime, and was an interpretation of his life and doctrine that had its roots in Jewish history and belief, and, in particular, in certain reactions to foreign rule and foreign culture that found expression in the religious movement of Apocalyptic Messianism. The others were later adaptations and extensions of the original gospel—the result of transplanting it from Jewish to pagan soil. But the Messianic gospel was not only rooted in history; it waited on history for confirmation in the near future, and history failed to justify it. This Messianic gospel faded into disillusion, and the other two survived; but they have no independent source of their own, and no basis in history apart from the illusory gospel from which they sprang. By the end of the century all contact with history is lost. Still later, gospels about Jesus came from Gnostic sources in great profusion and in every variety of fantastic invention, and Jesus is made to fill any rôle that suits the particular exponent of cosmic salvation. In the end Christianity became a world religion (or at any rate the religion of Western civilization), because it became a world Church;¹ or, as M. Loisy has put it, "*On a annoncé le règne de Dieu, et c'est l'Église qui venait.*"² No doubt this Church preserved for us through the Dark Ages much, though not all, that was vital in the religion and philosophy of the Age of Imperial Rome, and probably nothing but the Catholic Church could have done so. But the Catholic presentation of the realities of Christian faith as a Mystery of redemption and grace makes the realities of inner experience dependent on the indubitable truth *as facts in the history of the universe* of these legendary doctrines about Jesus, the prophet of Galilee. And that is precisely what is discredited to-day.'

In short, Mr. Bulcock has raised the issue which is going to determine the future of Christianity. Implicit in his questions is the wider question: Is it any longer possible, in the universe of process that we now realise that we live in, for the Church to insist on identifying the growing 'Christ' of experience with the vanishing 'Jesus' of history? Can it any longer maintain with dignity and self-respect, in the face of historical criticism of the New Testament, its claim to be a Divinely appointed Institution, with sacraments specially and Divinely appointed by Jesus, when both the conception of the 'Divine Society' and the sacraments of the Church are now clearly seen to be later developments of Christian organisation and practice assimilated from the prevailing religious ideas of the pagan world in which the Christian movement took shape and gathered momentum. As Mr. Bulcock says, we are thrown back on the task of discriminating between the facts of spiritual experience and the thought-forms of the age in which this experience found expression. He proposes a 'regress' to 'first principles of Christian worth,' with a view to a convincing re-statement of Christian

¹ See Alfred Fawkes' article on 'The Roman Contribution to Christianity' in the *Modern Churchman* of October, 1928.

² See *La Naissance du Christianisme*.

faith. He might have gone further. The crying need of this rapidly shrinking and limelit world is the need of a real world religion which would gather up the past religious experience of mankind from the four corners of the Earth, and express it in words which have meaning for us to-day. Theology, in ultimate analysis, is spiritual experience expressed in terms of current cosmology. Personal salvation in a terrifying universe was the primary religious quest of the Hellenistic age, and it was therefore as a Mystery of redemption and grace that Christianity was accepted by the Mediterranean world. Now when a Mystery of redemption and grace is committed to a Divine Institution, that Institution cannot fail to acquire immense power, and to retain it so long as men accept its claims. The Medieval Church thrived on the gospel of sin and salvation, but it was at the expense of human self-reliance and personal responsibility for the universe. The world is what we make of it, and it is in no small measure because for centuries we have failed to rise to our responsibilities that we find ourselves where we are to-day. The liturgy of the Church is one long wail of helplessness and impotence. It need not be so, if the Church would abandon claims which very few of the laity admit, and would search among the decaying *débris* of these outgrown beliefs for those strong roots of Christian faith and life which unite all Christians, and, what is more, which can be stated in terms of the cosmos of to-day. What is the dominant factor of the universe as we now know it? It is surely the fact that the Creation is one endless process in which man is called to take his indispensable part, within himself as well as in the universe at large. There are elements in Christian experience, hitherto relegated to the background of the liturgy and, notably, the Pauline and Johannine gospel of spirit through faith (to say nothing of the religious message of Platonism which, as Dr. Inge has reminded us, is inextricably bound up with them), which might be the basis of a liturgy of courage and faith, in which the emphasis is on the 'Christ' of experience through Whom man may realise his creative Self or Soul, and thus fulfil his creative vocation in the universe, in fellowship with the Eternal Creator Self, the immanent and transcendent God Who is both the Inwardness and the Fullness of Life.

T. B. LUARD.

Denny House, Waterbeach, Cambs.

January 15th, 1940.

SIR, MARVELS: MIRACULOUS OR NON-MIRACULOUS?

In your issue of December you published a letter under this title about fire-walking from the Rev. E. J. Strover. Anyone interested in fire-walking should read *Fifty Years of Psychological Research*, by H. Price, Chapter XIV (Longmans). It contains an account of experiments with fire-walkers, Indians and others, under controlled conditions. There is no mystery in fire-walking, and to do it successfully the help of religion is not necessary. It simply depends on walking quickly and with confidence. In the controlled experiments an Englishman was the best fire-walker. Here is another supposed miracle gone west.

These experiments illustrate an important principle. Science does not affirm or deny supposed marvels; it examines them. When examined under scientific conditions they turn out to be something different from what unskilled observation supposed.

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

Bitterley Rectory, Salop.

[The Editor regrets that owing to the very large amount of correspondence he has been compelled to hold over a number of communications for a subsequent issue.—Ed., M.C.]